

errors.

The objections to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.183(a) is noted. Since these corrections will be made when the final drawings are submitted, applicants' attorney respectfully submits that the claim language as well as the description in the Specification is clear enough to support the subject matter referred to in the claims which are objected to.

The allowability of claims 11, 12 and 15 is noted. Claim 11 has been rewritten as independent claim 18. Claim 12 has been made dependent from claim 18. Claim 17 has also been made dependent from claim 18. Accordingly, each of claims 18, 12 and 17 should be allowable. Claim 15 has been rewritten as independent claim 19. This claim also should be allowable.

Claims 9-11, 14 and 15 have been cancelled. Claims 20-22 have been added.

Claim 1, from which each of claims 2-8, 13, 16 and new claims 20-21 ultimately depend, has been amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and also to more clearly define the invention over the art of record. More particularly, claim 1 has been amended to set forth that the cover unit is for a flat display panel and includes a housing. There is a means for mounting the housing onto a wall surface. Further, there is a movable cover means within the housing to be disposed in front of the display panel and a means for moving the cover means to cover and uncover the

display panel.

Claims 1-10, 13-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Skovgaard, U.S. 5,138,462 or of Skovgaard in view of any one of Smart, U.S. 3,807,480, Green, U.S. 2,805,059 or Cook, U.S. 2,801,844. None of the art, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests applicants' novel invention as is now set forth in the claims.

With respect to the principal reference to Skovgaard, this is a conventional television set with a picture tube (CRT) having a neck which extends rearedly. The feature of Skovgaard appears to be that the CRT is located within a cabinet and there is a cover (4) positioned between the front face of the CRT and the cabinet glass (26 of Fig. 2). As can be seen, Skovgaard does not teach or suggest applicants' invention of a cover unit for a flat display panel which includes a housing which can be mounted on a wall surface. Such feature is not at all shown in any of the art of record. Because of the neck on the CRT, Skovgaard's unit could not be mounted on a wall.

In addition, as is set forth in claim 13, the flat display panel is also mounted within the housing. Thus, a fully integral unit is provided. That is, there is a housing which can be mounted on a wall within which housing is a flat display panel. Accordingly, when the housing is mounted on the wall, the

display panel is also mounted with it. Such feature is also not shown of suggested in Skovgaard where, as is set forth above, there is a conventional CRT with a rearedly extending neck.

The other art cited by the Examiner also does not teach or suggest any of the novel features of claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13 in the application clearly and patentably define over Skovgaard and should be allowed.

Insofar as claims 2-8 are concerned, these set forth further features of the unit which is defined in claim 1. More specifically, claim 2 sets forth that the moving means moves the cover vertically; claim 3 that the cover means is flexible; claim 4 that the moving means includes a roller onto which the cover is rolled and unrolled; claim 5 that the moving means is manually operated; claim 6 that the moving means is motor operated; claim 7 that the cover comprises a panel; and claim 8 that the moving means is motor operated by a remote control.

The Examiner relies upon a number of the secondary references to show these individual features. However, when these individual features of claims 2 through 8 are taken in combination with the main structure which is set forth in claim 1, these claims are also patentable and should be allowed since they fully distinguish over the prior art and provide novel and advantageous product.

Claims 20-22 respectively depend from claims 13, 18 and 19. Each of these claims clearly set forth that the cover unit has a display panel which is a flat panel video display. In view

of the allowability of the parent claims from which each of claims 20-22 depend, claims 18 and 19 already considered to be allowable, these claims are also patentable and should be allowed.

It is submitted that the foregoing amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon D. Coplein
by *Gordon D. Coplein* Reg. No.
Gordon D. Coplein
Reg. No. 19,165
33449
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 557-7700